

'I think we should be men first and subjects afterward. It is not desirable to cultivate a respect for the law, so much as for the right.'
H. D. THOREAU.

In this Issue:
TO SIT DOWN IS NOT TO SIT BACK
AMNESTY OR ANARCHY?
AROUND THE GALLERIES
ECONOMICS, NEVILLE CHAMBERLAIN AND US

"NEGOTIATIONS that opened here this week could affect the economic and political future of the whole world long after the Berlin crisis has been forgotten." Thus wrote a correspondent of the *New York Times* describing the significance of the meeting of the members of the Common Market in Brussels last month, at which Britains' application for admission was to be considered. Since for the *New York Times* and the Press in general the Berlin crisis brought the world as near the brink as any crisis in the post-war years, the comment as to the importance of the developments in the Common Market negotiations is therefore all the more significant. So far as we are concerned it has seemed to us that the Berlin "crisis" has been much overrated and the sinister implications of the Common Market underestimated.

We wrote in August that the EEC (European Economic Community or Common Market) was a "scheme to consolidate the capitalist system". The *New York Times* writer forecasts that "if the Common Market works, and if Britain gets in, something like a new European superpower may be the result—at least an economic superpower". Of course, as he points out, there are all kinds of difficulties to overcome; in the case of Britain alone the number of matters to be settled is "several score", and among the Six themselves there is the possibility that lack of progress on the questions of agriculture may well prevent them from passing on to the "second stage" of the Common Market due to start in the New Year. But this is not surprising for though the participants have one thing in common—to defend and to consolidate if possible the capitalist system—they are all concerned with ensuring that in the long term, if not immediately, their individual interests will prosper by whatever decisions are taken.

To say that capitalists are loyal to their class is as untrue as to say that workers are loyal to theirs. It is noteworthy that both the trades union organisations and the employers' organisations are numerically strongest in times of so-called

Common Market or Community?

"prosperity", that is when demand exceeds supply, and weakest during slumps and trade recessions. And the reason is an obvious one. In times of "prosperity" the unions can press demands for better conditions and increased rates of pay which the employers are prepared to accede to because they are riding the crest of a sellers' market. And it is in the interests of the employers to co-operate among themselves to keep up the price of the commodi-

ties they produce. So long as all concerns are working to capacity it is foolish to cut prices—that is to compete with one another. Hence the "rings". But when, on the other hand there is a recession in trade, when plant is not being worked to capacity, when large numbers of workers are idle, the unions become less demanding themselves, and the employees' associations less co-operative.

Many of the skilled workers who

know they can negotiate a better contract with an employer, who knows their worth, than their Union which will attempt to negotiate on a national basis and in terms of the economic situation in industry as a whole and not of particular enterprises, will leave the unions. So too will unskilled workers who in the struggle to earn a living to keep their families alive will be prepared to work at a lower rate than that fixed by the unions. Similarly the

employers themselves in the scramble to get contracts will leave the "rings" and slash prices. Capitalists are always talking of "healthy competition", yet it is the last thing they believe in. Or, more accurately, they believe in competition as a powerful weapon to eliminate competitors in their field of business. Any self-respecting capitalist must feel the need to "go forward", to "expand". If his plant is operating to capacity he must either expand, by new building and new equipment, or absorb someone else's plant. And the latter, involving the much publicised "take-over bid", has the advantage that in increasing your productive capacity you have at the same time secured an existing market as well as having eliminated a "competitor"!

★
NOW, the European Economic Community, or Common Market is, *par excellence*, a capitalist device to consolidate the capitalist system as such and at the same time to control production. For is it not clear that if within the Common Market nations all tariff barriers are removed, price (all other things being equal) will decide the ability of a manufacturer, or a farmer, to continue in production? Indeed, the economist, Graham Hutton, writing in *The Challenge of Europe* (a *Financial Times* publication) points out that

When Britain joins [the Common Market] her industries and firms will not only have to look at her new economic allies' costs and prices, as shown up in our home market and in theirs... [they] will also have to look at these allies' costs and our own, to determine whether production of this or that should be more concentrated in the United Kingdom or within the continental European Economic Community.

Not only does it almost invariably mean that the smaller industrial units will be either absorbed by their big brothers(!) or driven out of business through inability to "compete", but the possible disappearance of whole industries may well result in growing unemployment (a situation which, as we pointed out last week, does not alarm us so long as the people concerned have free access to the means of life!) Curious-

Continued on page 3

TO SIT DOWN IS NOT TO SIT BACK

ON Saturday, December 9th, thousands of people will be demonstrating against nuclear weapons. The method they have chosen for their demonstration is that of the 'sit down'.

Critics of the Committee of 100 attack this method as irresponsible, showing a disrespect for the law, a lack of citizenship, undemocratic tendencies, or a predisposition to mob action—or to repeat a really horrid swear-word "anarchic". At its best they claim the sit down is doing nothing.

Campaigns against nuclear disarmament have fallen into three categories with some mixture of motives and membership. One object of a campaign is to form a pressure group to make the government or the opposition (which is felt, for some mysterious reason, to be more sympathetic and effective) revise its policy on nuclear arms. This is to be done through the ballot-box. Another object is to secure publicity for the aims and objects of the campaign. This is done by staging demonstrations so huge or unconventional that the mass media are forced to take notice. The third object (a little more obscure and rarely achieved) is 'direct action' in which the action itself is directly related

to the project. Unfortunately a great deal of what passes for direct action is purely symbolic in its performance and even that seems to some to be invalidated by the custom of informing and co-operating with police and authorities.

A fourth object of the campaign which seems to be gradually being realized is the effect upon the individual taking part. By his affirmation of his intention not to co-operate in the face of nuclear defence or horror of nuclear aggression, the individual can learn valuable lessons.

"Doing nothing" when the world is full of insane activities is very often the sanest thing one can do. Bombs are not dropped (or invented), concentration camps are not staffed, armies do not march without individuals who do these things; the world could be saved by disobedience "Good men do not obey the laws too well".

The basis of the philosophies of Thoreau, of Tolstoy, of Gandhi and of many others rest upon the ideas of non-resistance, non-violent resistance and non-co-operation.

Many of us cannot go all the way with the believers in non-resistance. Gandhi has formulated it as the "law of conscious suffering". It is felt that such doctrines have within them a streak of masochism. It is inevitable that there should be what is called "martyrdom" in supporting any unpopular cause, but one's love of life should be too great to voluntarily embrace "martyrdom". Persecution comes soon enough without "asking for it".

If we reject nuclear weapons, and even if we adopt a policy of neutrality it is possible that we will be invaded by the Russians, or by the Americans (both of course with the best of motives), to maintain security.

Methods of direct action will be as effective as we can make them; against the British authorities as against the Russians, or against the Americans.

They have proved their value in India against the British, in Norway and Denmark against the Germans and in many other countries and times.

The methods of direct action include strikes, sabotage and the boycott which can be used for conflicts on the industrial, political and personal levels. They can be elevated to the religio-mystical realms of *ahimsa hartel* and *satyagraha* or take such sordid forms as rent-strikes or tax-refusal.

Direct action has been employed in differing forms and with different degrees of success by the Land League in Ireland, the suffragettes in England, the abolitionists in America, the unemployed in England in the later 'thirties, and the negroes in the Southern States in the late 'fifties.

Sitting down is not sitting back and "doing nothing". The five-yearly rush to the ballot-box as Thoreau says, "is a sort of gaming, like chequers or backgammon, with a slight moral tinge to it, a playing with right and wrong, with moral questions; and betting naturally accompanies it. The character of the voters is not staked. I cast my vote, perchance, as I think right; but I am not vitally concerned that that right should prevail. I am willing to leave it to the majority. Its obligation, therefore, never exceeds that of expediency. Even voting for the right is doing nothing for it. It is only expressing to men feebly your desire that it should prevail. A wise man will not leave the right to the mercy of chance, nor wish it to prevail through the power of the majority. There is but little virtue in the action of the masses of men. When the majority shall at length vote for the abolition of slavery, it will be because they are indifferent to slavery, or because there is but little slavery left to be abolished by their vote."

Slavery was abolished not by the vote or by the Civil War, but by the individuals who refused to hold slaves, or to pay taxes, or helped runaway slaves. In the same way nuclear weapons will be abolished by the philosophy of direct action, the keystone of anarchism.

J.R.

LESS FOOD, MORE MONEY

"RECORD Trade in Wheat" is the headline to a news item in the *Guardian*, reporting the recent meeting of the International Wheat Council in London. According to the Council the outlook for 1961-62 indicates some alleviation in the world wheat situation, with trade likely to reach record levels and stocks declining substantially for the first time in four years.

Should the reader imagine that the hungry millions of South America, Africa, and Asia are at last being given some of the surpluses, he is only showing how ingenuous we laymen can be.

"These prospective improvements in the world supply-demand position," the Council said "are, however, almost en-

tirely due to weather factors which resulted in a sharp fall in production in 1961 in Canada, smaller crops in the United States and many countries of Western Europe and the increased import requirements of mainland China.

"While it is too early to forecast the level of wheat production in 1962, it should be noted that the conditions for winter wheat in the United States and western Europe are generally favourable.

"But in the hard spring wheat area of Canada and the United States moisture reserves are exceptionally low. At the same time, the new United States wheat production programme to reduce the wheat acreage could have important effects by way of smaller supplies.

"As a consequence, the large stocks which have overshadowed the world wheat market in recent years are likely to be closer to the world requirements particularly as far as quality wheats are concerned."

Not, surely, "closer to world requirements" but closer to "demand" backed by the ability to pay in hard cash. The starving millions are still starving; their requirements are still for food, but so far as the 33 member countries of the Wheat Council are concerned these millions of hungry mouths don't come into their calculations.

ANARCHY 10

ANARCHY is Published by Freedom Press at 1/6 on the last Saturday of every month.

GET YOUR COPY NOW!

Scapegoat Politics in Sweden

MIQUEL GRACA, a negro student from Portuguese Angola living in this country, has found himself being stuffed into the cannons of Sweden's political party antagonisms. The authorities here have tried to force him to sign a paper saying that the child of a Swedish girl is his. He refused this, and the girl's father wrote a letter to the Foreigners' Commission (organization controlling and giving visas), complaining—although the contents of the letter were stamped 'secret to the public and press'. The Commission's board, consisting of about eight people including an ambassador, Chief of Police, and a very strong member of the Moral Re-armament movement who happens to be the Chief of the Commission—decided that the student must be deported.

The Liberal evening paper *Expressen* took up the case (although not without some political motive) and defended the student's "rights" to stay in the country. Revealing the fact that a firing squad was awaiting him if they put him on a plane to Portugal. He claimed political asylum. He also stated that the Commission already knew this. Also in an article to the same paper he mentioned

that his experiences during his stay in this country was like living in a dictatorship or police state. Frightened, bewildered into saying that he "didn't feel discriminated against and that there was no race prejudice in Sweden", he needed his visa badly. Forced to choose between the executioner and a bourgeois education here.

The Liberals have now turned this into a political fight and accuse (rightly so) the Social Democratic Government of racial discrimination. In an editorial they put twelve questions to Prime Minister and Minister of Interior complaining of the treatment of "foreigners" in unj(ste to o "sqbr", rreqr pue Ljunos oqr in spite of race, religion or political opinion. This question will no doubt turn into a lively and amusing debate when Sweden's political hypocrites start throwing their dirt when the Government opens its session tomorrow.

There can not be more than a handful of coloured people in this country, but they certainly intend making use of their propaganda value to satisfy the needs of the stinking fish of Swedish party politics.
H.

APPEAL FOR AMNESTY 1961 is an international organisation, formed after the publication of an article in the *Observer* last May, whose aim is to secure the release of all political prisoners throughout the world. Its chief weapons are a library containing details of all known political prisoners, which is expected to contain more than a million names, and a regular newspaper called *Amnesty*, which is an English fortnightly at the moment but will be a multilingual weekly soon. The organisation—whose address, if you are interested, is 1 Mitre Court Buildings, The Temple, London E.C.4.—was launched by Peter Benenson, the English lawyer and Labour candidate who also launched "Justice" (the British Section of the International Commission of Jurists) five years ago, who wrote the original *Observer* article and has now written a short Penguin Special called *Persecution 1961* (Penguin Books, 2/6d.).

This book tells the story of nine victims of political persecution: MAURICE AUDIN, the French Algerian communist mathematician who was arrested in Algiers on 11 June 1957, interrogated and tortured by *paras* at El-Biar, and almost certainly killed by them ten days after his arrest, though he was reported to have escaped and is still officially alive. The French authorities of the Fourth and Fifth Republics alike have taken care to prevent any proper investigation of his disappearance, and have not ventured to proceed against those who have publicly accused them of complicity in his murder.

ASHTON JONES, the American Congregationalist minister from a poor-white family in Georgia who for thirty years has been preaching in the open as Fox

Amnesty or Anarchy

and Wesley did, travelling first on foot and then in a brightly-painted van all over the USA and in South America, Europe and the Far East as well. Being a well-known opponent of racial segregation, he took part in a sit-in at a Dallas luncheon-counter in Spring 1960, after which he was imprisoned as a vagrant for 14 days in Marshall, Texas, and for 60 days in Shreveport, Louisiana, and was severely beaten up at least seven times while in custody by both jailers and prisoners; he was also shot at in January 1961, at Jackson, Mississippi (the town where dozens of Freedom riders were arrested in May).

AGOSTINHO NETO, almost the only Angolan poet and doctor, who was imprisoned for a few weeks in 1952 and again from February 1955 to June 1957, while studying in Portugal, and has been detained on Santo Antão in the Cape Verde islands since June 1960, when he was arrested and publicly flogged outside his surgery (the crowd that gathered afterwards was fired on and at least thirty people were killed). Since then of course, the bitter Angolan rising has begun.

PATRICK DUNCAN, the crippled son of the first South African Governor of South Africa, who has been a Judicial Commissioner and an Assistant District Commissioner in Basutoland, but in 1952 joined the campaign against apartheid as a leader first of the Passive Resistance Movement and then of the Liberal Party, and as the editor of the Liberal magazine *Contact*. He has been in prison three times for these activities (though he missed the Treason Trial), and in March 1961, he was banned from attending any meeting for five years.

OLGA IVINSKAYA, Pasternak's friend—the model for Lara Gishar in *Dr. Zhivago*—and his literary collaborator and executor, who was arrested in 1948 and sent to Siberia from 1949 to 1953 for shielding him (this was during Stalin's final anti-semitic phase). She was released and rehabilitated after Stalin's death, but in August 1960 she was arrested again and four months later sentenced to eight years' imprisonment for alleged currency offences connected with Pasternak's Western royalties (which amount to more than half a million pounds); her 22-year-old daughter, Irina Yemilianova, got three years for alleged complicity. The real reason for this behaviour is of course that Pasternak was too big for the Russian authorities to punish as they would have liked, but when he died in May 1960, they could vent their spite on his closest friends. A further possible reason seems to be that he left an unfinished dramatic trilogy and Olga Ivinskaya has refused to give her approval to its political expurgation, just as Pasternak himself had always refused to expurgate his own work while he was still alive.

LUIS TARGU, the socialist leader of the Huk guerrillas of Luzon, a Philippine mixture of Fidel Castro and Mao Tse-tung who resisted the Japanese during

the war and the Americans and pro-American Filipinos after it. He was arrested by the Americans twice in 1945, and has been in prison since he was betrayed to the Philippine authorities in 1954, serving concurrent life sentences. CONSTANTIN NOICA, the Rumanian transcendental philosopher who has been unable to publish any of his books since the war, was banished to Campalung in 1955, and was sentenced to 25 years' imprisonment for alleged treason in 1959. His real offence has been his complete intellectual independence, which is very similar to that of Pasternak.

ANTONIO AMAT, the Spanish Basque lawyer and moderate socialist leader who was imprisoned from 1934 to 1945 for trying to join the French *maquis* and from 1951 to 1955 for opposition activities, and was held without trial in the Carabanchel Prison of Madrid from November 1958 to May 1961; he still hasn't been tried. He is lucky—there are thousands of people who have lived in Spanish prisons since the Civil War ended more than twenty-two years ago.

HU FENG, the Chinese poet and journalist, who was a favourite disciple of the great Lu Hsun and has been a lifelong Communist (for which he was imprisoned in Japan for a time in 1933). After many years of disapproval from his fellow-writers and persecution from the Chinese authorities for his "subjectivism" or "idealism"—i.e. romantic individualism—he was imprisoned in Summer 1955 after declining to make a sufficiently abject recantation of his heresy.

Nine men; it is only a few minutes' work to double or treble that number from well known names without really trying. In Algeria, for example, you can take top people like Mohammed Ben-Bella, the FLN leader who was in prison from 1949 until he escaped in 1952 and has been inside again since he was kidnapped by the French on 22 October 1956; or humble people like Djamilia Boupacha, the young woman who has suffered hideous tortures at the hands of the *paras*, being severely injured when they impaled her on a bottle. There is of course Audin's friend Henri Alleg (real name Sallem), the French Algerian (half-English) communist journalist mentioned by Benenson who was arrested the day after Audin and tortured by *paras* at El-Biar for a month before being sent to the Algiers civil prison, where he wrote *La Question* later in 1957. The book was published by Jérôme Lindon of Les Editions de Minuit in February 1958, and the following month won the distinction of being the first book banned in France for political reasons since the Revolution. In June 1960, Alleg was sentenced to ten years' imprisonment, but in October 1961, he escaped from Rennes prison and is now in Prague.

After *La Question* came *La Gangrène*, also published by Lindon, the accounts of six young Algerians tortured in Paris at the police station in the Rue des Saussaies during December 1958; the

book was published and banned in June 1959. In the English edition of *Gangrène* (published by John Calder, as was *The Question*), the second half was devoted to the behaviour of the British authorities in Kenya. There was the story of Capt. Ernest Law, the regular soldier who entered the Kenyan Prison Service after the War only to be kicked out in November 1955, after protesting against the ill-treatment of Mau-Mau detainees in Nairobi prison (some of the 80,000 held without trial after the Emergency), was himself detained without trial from January to June 1958, in Kamiti prison, where he witnessed further atrocities, and was finally flown home penniless. There was also the story of the Hola massacre, which took place on 3 March 1959, while the Government was still resisting any inquiry into Law's complaints, 85 Mau-Mau prisoners from the Hola Detention Camp being put to forced labour under the official "Cowan Plan" and eleven of them being beaten to death in the process. The Camp Commandant and Deputy Commandant were disciplined, but Mr. J. B. T. Cowan, the author of the Plan, was awarded the M.B.E. the following June.

The South Africans do pretty well too, though they made the mistake of letting photographers catch them in the act. On 21 March 1960, eighty unarmed people were shot dead and hundreds wounded at Sharpeville and Langa. Compared to this sort of thing, the treatment of the American freedom-riders in Montgomery, Alabama, on 20 May 1961, seems unnecessarily lenient.

At least the American authorities are officially against racial segregation. In South Africa, the authorities have managed to drive almost all decent men into prison or exile. Patrick Duncan is by no means the only white man to have committed himself against apartheid. Michael Scott was imprisoned from June to October 1946, for joining Indian passive resistance demonstrations in Durban, and was given a suspended sentence in April 1947, for living in an African shanty town near Johannesburg; in 1951 he was declared a prohibited immigrant after his outstanding defence of the natives of South West Africa at the United Nations (and recently he has become a leader of the Direct Action Committee and the Committee of 100 in this country, going to prison several times.) Then there is Ronald Segal, who ran *Africa South* for years and only just managed to escape to England after Sharpeville. For the blacks there is Albert Luthuli, an elected Chief and the President-General of the banned African National Congress, who was one of the 156 people arrested for the farcical Treason Trial five years ago, and has since then been banished, banned from attending meetings for five years in May 1959, and arrested again after Sharpeville; now he has been given last year's Nobel Peace Prize.

In what remains of the good old Commonwealth there is still Sheikh Ab-

dullah of Kashmir, who was sentenced to nine years' imprisonment by the British puppet Maharajah in August 1946, became Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir after "independence", and has again been imprisoned by the Indian regime since August 1953, with a few weeks at liberty early in 1958. This should be a good qualification for becoming Prime Minister again, like Nehru—his present captor—Nkrumah, Makarios, Banda and now, it seems, Kenyatta as well.

Elsewhere in the free world freedom is often hard to find. Back in America, Willard Uphaus, a Methodist minister mentioned by Benenson, spent 1960 in jail rather than tell the Attorney-General of New Hampshire the names of his guests at a summer-camp he organised in 1954. And down in Mexico there are David Alfaro Siqueiros, the painter, and Filomeno Mata, the journalist, who have been imprisoned since August 1960, for their part in a campaign for the release of thousands of Mexican political prisoners. This sort of thing is reminiscent of what goes on behind the Iron Curtain, where the three victims mentioned by Benenson are by no means the only ones; think of Wolfgang Harich, the East Berlin Professor of Social Sciences who was sentenced to ten years' imprisonment in March 1957, for his revisionist ideas, or Tibor Déry, the Hungarian writer who was imprisoned after the 1956 Rising and only released later because he had too many friends in the West.

And all these are just the big ones, the names that get into the press and are used as weapons in complicated political games. Even if they lose life and liberty, their names will be remembered. But, as Ecclesiasticus puts it, "some there be which have no memorial". Some?—there are millions of them, the people who get massacred and shot and bombed and turned away from hospitals and luncheon-counters and lodgings, the village Hampdens and mute inglorious Miltons and Cromwells guiltless of their countries' blood, all the meek who should inherit the earth but never do more than dig it. Peter Benenson's little book is useful and desirable, although it is rather badly written—as his introduction to *Gangrène* was (and there is a horrible misquotation from *Animal Farm* on p. 35)—but it is too short and its range is too narrow. A general survey of political persecution all over the world, with all the names, would have had far more impact. After all, hardly any country is innocent. Even here in dear little England a handful of people are in prison for peaceful political activity and the police made a half-hearted imitation of their French colleagues on 17 September, 1961. We should give credit to Appeal for Amnesty for its honest attempt to open up the whole dirty business of modern persecution; but we must recognise that so far it is only a liberal nibble at something that needs a great big radical bite. It is not enough to free individual prisoners—it is the practice of imprisonment that is in question, and behind it the existence of political authority itself. Think of the anonymous but real hero of Ernst von Salomon's recent book, *The Captive*, who was held in prison from 1923 to 1950 by the Weimar régime, the Nazis and the American occupation authorities. He is a symbol of us all.

N.W.

BOOKS FOR CHRISTMAS

We can supply

ANY book in print. Also out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found! This includes paper-backs, children's books and text books. (Please supply publisher's name if possible).

NEW BOOKS

Venice Observed (ed.) Mary McCarthy 15/-
The Worker in an Affluent Society Ferdinand Zweig 25/-
Poems in English Samuel Beckett 13/6

CHEAP EDITIONS

We are the Living Erskine Caldwell 2/6

SECOND-HAND

The Pattern of Soviet Domination Stanislaw Mikolajczyk 12/6
Primitive Civilizations E. J. Simcox (Vol. 1) 8/6
The Creation of Christ P. L. Couchoud (2 vols.) 15/- set
Very Private Enterprise Aylmer Vallance 7/6
The Wisdom of Schopenhauer (Sel.) Walter Jekyll 5/-
The Assassins Robert T. Donovan 5/-
Autobiography of a German Rebel Toni Sender 5/6
The Defeat of Poverty Hartley Withers 3/-
Armies of Free Men (1940) Tom Wintringham 3/6
The Land of Soviets N. Mikhailov, &c. 3/-
England Expects Every American to do his Duty (1938) Quincy Howe 4/-
A Prophet of the Soul Zenta Maurina 5/-
John Ruskin: Social Reformer J. A. Hobson 7/6
The Quintessence of Socialism A. Schäffle 3/-
Socialism and Positive Science Enrico Ferri 3/6
Julius Fenton F. L. Green 3/-
Evolution Chapman Pincher 3/-
The State and the Nation Edward Jenks 3/-
Some Aspects of Industrial Problems Gertrude Williams 4/-
The Writer and the Commissar George Palocz-Horvath 4/-
The Evolution of Marriage Ch. Letourneau 4/6

Book tokens accepted

Freedom Bookshop

(Open 2 p.m.—5.30 p.m. daily;
10 a.m.—1 p.m. Thursdays;
10 a.m.—5 p.m. Saturdays).

17a MAXWELL ROAD

FULHAM SW6 Tel: REN 3736

A MAJOR exhibition for those interested in following the trends in contemporary painting is supplied by the Matthiesen Gallery at 142 New Bond Street, W.1. They have given the whole of their dog-leg shaped gallery over to the work of Charles Blackman and having cleaned up, financially, with the Nolan exhibition, feel confident that they can repeat their success. Like Nolan, Blackman is an Australian artist who at the age of 33 arrived here this year with an imposing list of exhibitions and works "in the collection of . . ." behind him in Australia. And the operative word is "behind" for while Nolan and Blackman are billed as Australian artists—they can but regurgitate in a matter of months the assimilated native background of their short working lives, for a newly acquired and more sophisticated background must draw them with perceptible speed into the main stream of contemporary European painting and the title of Australian painting can be of short duration.

Nolan's skill as a painter is so slight that I feel that he has shot his bolt when he exhausted his childlike interpretations of Australian folklore but astute dealers and the *haut ton* will find a use for his slight but pleasant work, but Blackman possesses a professional naivety that can cover up those aspects of his bad workmanship and at the same time give a

Around the Galleries

sheen of childish innocence to his slick professionalism. On the left as one enters the gallery is a canvas that contains the figure of a young girl and a crudely painted silhouette of a boy and a casual glance would dismiss or accept this painting as a charming neo-primitive, if it were not that the girl's far hand has not been painted, but rapidly sketched in with the reverse end of the brush into the wet paint of the background. This is the professional naivety that haunts all these paintings.

Bryan Robertson, of the Whitechapel Gallery, in the catalogue blurb, traces Blackman's formal roots as a painter beyond the Renaissance, even unto the Byzantium tradition, but for myself, I find that these somnolescent, brightly painted creatures, drifting across a background of meaningless graffiti have more in common with the American-Jewish painters of our generation than an Eastern Empire of the 12th or 14th century. Blackman possesses the sad dream-like quality of the American-Jewish Bernard Perlin, and from Perlin he has learned to create a background of signs and symbols such as Perlin uses with such good effect in his painting of

the "Two Jewish boys" in the Tate, but unlike Perlin, Blackman hesitates to translate his dumb signs into statements. That Blackman will be drawn into the Establishment of accepted *avant garde* painters now seems inevitable and this exhibition must be regarded as his successful springboard into the big time.

Mary Brooks, the co-director of the Woodstock Gallery, has crossed Oxford Street for a one woman show down in the New Vision Centre at 4 Seymour Place, W.1. She is the worst judge of her own work, for she has chosen to reproduce two of her many bad canvases in her catalogue. This is unfortunate, for in at least three grid-like abstractions she has produced work of a lyric and literary quality in the true English vein. They possess the dream-like vision of Blake's backgrounds when the mystical is seen with the eye of innocence.

December is always a good month for those with money who aspire to join the esoteric ranks of the collectors for this is the season of the year when the dealers cram as much of their small stuff upon their walls as they can, and all at prices within the range of the well-heeled

Christmas-present shoppers. Dr. Roland, at his gallery at 19 Cork Street W.1., has 169 canvases on display with prices that range from 1,400 Gns. for a tiny Boudin oil via a 600 Gns. chalk drawing by Augustus John to a 9 Gns. oil by Susan Zileri, but my money, if I had any, would be considered well spent on the 35 Gns. pen and wash by Tom Rowlandson, at the Sabin Gallery at 4 Cork Street, W.1., for under the lash of economic necessity, even this staid gallery has thrown its doors open to the flat-footed seasonal *hoi polloi* and I am the one in the torn mac.

But the gayest exhibition of the month are a proles of Alan (Sam) Smith at the Portal Gallery at 16a, Grafton Street, W.1. These movable wooden figures are characters straight out of the old American Police Gazette illustrations. Here are the pugs, the whores and the singing barbers of that public recorder reborn into a third dimension. Carved and painted by a man whose own life is as bizarre as his creations, they would, if cast in clay be worthy of becoming collectors' pieces. At £10 a time they are beyond the pockets of most of us, but for those who can afford it it is money well spent, for against a background of Sally Duckbury's charming monotypes they truly mark the season of myth and tradition.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

Common Market or Community?

Continued from page 1

ly enough Mr. Kennedy, the American President, had something to say on this subject at his News Conference last week. (We quote from the official transcript at length since we have seen no mention of these significant remarks in the British Press).

Question: Mr. President, Senator Goldwater has indicated his opposition to us becoming associated with the Common Market. Would you comment on that and perhaps sum up for us the possible effect the Common Market might have on the American economy?

Answer: Yes. I don't know what the word "associated" means in the question. I have not heard proposed that the United States should become a member of the Common Market or associated with the Common Market in the sense that the word is ordinarily used.

What we are concerned about is that we have the power to negotiate with the Common Market to protect our export industry. The Common Market will represent a tremendously important market for American production. It is one of our areas where we have concentrated most in recent years and represents a tremendous potential for us in the future, particularly when Great Britain joins it. We want to, therefore, protect our export market.

We want to keep the ratio of exports to imports comparable to what it is today or perhaps even improve it, because if we are not able to export substantially more than we import we are going to either have to cut off all assistance to countries abroad or begin to withdraw our troops home.

We spend nearly three billion dollars a year [£1,000 million] in keeping our bases and troops abroad. That represents a three billion dollar drain upon us. The only reason we have been able to afford that is that we have a balance of trade in our favour of around five billion dollars.

In addition, we are concerned that American companies who are locked out of the Common Market because of their high tariffs will feel that the only way that they can get into the market will be through investing in Western Europe, and therefore we will have capital leaving which will cost jobs. Every time an American firm invests in Europe and builds its company there, it hires European workers and not American workers. We believe in the free flow of capital. We do not believe in capital exchanging.

Therefore, we have to have the ability to negotiate with the Common Market so that American goods can enter the Market and we will not have American capital jumping the wall in order to compete. So that this is a matter of great importance to the American workers and industry and the American economy.

It is in that, it is because of that reason—as well as our desire to associate as closely as we can to Europe, which is going to be such an important power and force—that we are considering what our trade programme will be. But if you use the word "associate" with the Common Market, or joining the Common Market, that is not an accurate description of our policy.

We believe Mr. Kennedy's concern that American industrialists should be in a position to sell to Europe rather than engage in, for them, the equally profitable occupation of investing in Europe is genuine enough. As the spokesman of big business and at the same time head of State his attitude is one of greater responsibility to his class than any individual industrialist would be inclined to show. Kennedy is concerned with the problem of unemployment which represents some 7 per cent, of the working population, because obviously he realises that the task of government, of maintaining the economic and political status quo, would be great-

ly jeopardised if another 2 or 3 million American workers joined the dole queue.

This consideration does not unduly worry the British ruling class at present. Already a number of the large industrial firms have done what the American President fears his industrialist friends will be doing on a large scale. I.C.I., Bowaters, Unilever, Lucas have European subsidiaries or have made consortium arrangements with their European counterparts. Only last week, we learned from the financial columns of the *Guardian* that Mr. Harry Rael-Brook, chairman of the firm of that name, which claims to be the largest shirt-making firm in Britain, had directed part of his wealth into Italy and after 18 months production in his Turin factory was "confident that within three years we shall be the biggest shirtmakers in Italy". Mr. Rael-Brook patriotically pointed out that one advantage in manufacturing there was that taxation for his firm amounted to only 15 per cent. on the total. He now has a second factory under construction in Italy. Need one point out that in the event of Britain joining the Common Market, Mr. Rael-Brook might well find that it suits his interests to concentrate all his production in Italy?

★
DO we think then that workers in this country and in the EEC will be worse off as a result of this new alignment of the capitalist system? Materially, the answer is that probably on the whole they will be no worse off in the long run, for mass unemployment is today neither in the political nor financial interests of the ruling class. It may even be that the working week will be reduced to 36 hours in the next decade. But since the ruling class concedes nothing except under duress, the price they will demand from the workers will be ever greater subservience. And this they will seek to achieve by insisting on the mobility of Labour within the European "Community" and the maintenance of a permanent pool of unemployment, sufficiently large to create a feeling of insecurity in the worker and his family, but not so large as to either upset the markets or provoke movements of discontent and revolt.

★
WESTERN Capitalism is obviously straining to keep up with the times . . . and keep its privileges. What are the workers doing to destroy the society based on privilege and social and economic injustice in which they are the victims?

Mr. Macmillan at a meeting in Sheffield, last week, told his audience that in this island we have a "free society". The government had no power to fix wages in private industry, nor in the nationalised industries. "Of course we could take power" he added. That would involve fixing profits, dividends and prices. But "it would be a shocking admission of defeat to say that our people are incapable of self-control and that the only way out is to be controlled by the government in every aspect of economic life". This is just what we anarchists are continually telling our fellow workers. Don't let the government control your lives, don't depend on the boss for your livelihood. You are the producers; take the means of production and produce for the needs of the whole community! To accept anything less than that would be, in the Prime Minister's words, "a shocking admission of defeat".

THE first big modern credit-squeeze was imposed in the autumn of 1920. (It was called a slump). The aim was to mop up surplus cash from workers, returned soldiers and their wives who had been on war work. Those years were filled with revolutionary ferment. In 1919 disgruntled ex-soldiers rioted, looted, and smashed up certain town-centres. The revolution in Russia had immediately stimulated ideas of socialism.

But big business, with huge war profits in hand, was intent on driving workers back to pre-1914 conditions. In 1919 the managers of the large car firm I worked for told us "We can afford to shut down for two years if necessary, and the shareholders won't lose—we can pay them full dividends regardless of what happens to you." Our spokesman replied: "We know you can—out of the millions you made in war profits." That threat materialised in 1920. Millions of skilled men were thrown out of work for two years and more. Where there was no dole men went to the workhouse for out-relief—50,000 of us in Coventry alone. We played hell all round and wrung all kinds of concessions from authority. Very many of us spent the two years educating ourselves—reading, arguing and organising meetings. In this "slump" thousands of firms were ruined, or near ruined.

This deliberate squeeze was made possible by looting Germany under the name of Reparations. Germany was used, to beat us with.

J. M. Keynes resigned (from a Treasury post) when this policy was put over at the Versailles Peace Conference. He pointed out the inevitable consequences to British industry of such brainless ineptitude. His book became a best seller. All his forecasts came true—ruin in coal, steel, shipbuilding, engineering and other basic industries. The miners fought this insanity up to and beyond the general strike of 1926—we all fought in some degree. Years of stagnation were followed by a real slump in 1930-1931—unintended this time. Capitalism nearly collapsed, especially in the USA. Electors here were stampeded into voting Conservative through superstitious fear and awe of money. Stagnation continued after the slump due to the stranglehold of money-power manipulated by a backward-looking autocracy. They skimmed the cream off a half-productive country and shared it with their middle-class supporters, thereby creating poverty.

Keynes continued throughout these years to teach expansionist finance to make capitalism abundant—wartime economics applied to peacetime. Socialists, while condemning capitalism, were advocating and supporting the very reforms that saved the system from self-destruction. A dreary half-dead capitalism fooled the people into disbelief in their own creative powers. But the slump in USA provided the first proof of the Keynesian thesis in Roosevelt's New Deal—almost by accident it seems.

The Hitler stampede provided another proof—Germany bursting with energy—"guns instead of butter". Keynes had said "Spend sufficient money and the system will work." Asked "What on?" he replied, "Anything. You could dig holes and fill them up." In England, that apostle of orthodox finance Neville Chamberlain, reflected exactly his country's past financial dominance with "Don't worry about Hitler—I can deal with him. Sooner or later he is bound to run out of money, and then he will have to come to us." So, Chamberlain appeased Hitler—with other countries' money and freedoms. He never understood that twentieth-century production demands mass consumption. This could provide very good things for all people—or a raging stupid selfish capitalism as in the USA—or a vast war machine as in Germany.

Let's see the colour of it!

The deficit continues to mount up week by week, and in spite of generous support from some of our readers to the Deficit Fund the gap is larger than ever. It seems almost certain that by the end of the year we shall have a deficit of £2,000 and that only half this amount will be covered by contributions to the Fund.

ECONOMICS, NEVILLE CHAMBERLAIN AND US

That pitifully limited cocksure man Chamberlain, good by his own standards, dominated ruling class circles. His ideas made war certain—encouraging madmen. A few weeks before the war he broadcast about the Japanese: "Sooner or later they will run out of money . . ." (I nearly chopped my radio up in furious impotence!) He next sent a Treasury representative to offer Hitler a loan of one thousand million pounds, seeking to buy him off. Hitler of course was taking over assets and manufacturing money based on production. (When I say Hitler here, I mean that the real job was done by unknown experts, Hitler remained a clairvoyant lunatic.)

We moved on to an inevitable war. I searched my radio night after night for vital news. It came: Stalin had summoned the Russian "parliament". Some members were a week or more travelling from remote places—(there were excuses, postponements—delegates late.)

At last it came: the Soviet parliament had ratified the Soviet-German Pact. That meant war. Stalin had given Hitler the O.K. Stalin had put the responsibility for starting war on his own people—stooges, but people—innocent mainly. Hitler wouldn't dare move until he was sure of Russia—Stalin "proved" by the vote that he carried Russia with him. I turned the radio off—I was grim. My wife asked "Are you going mad?" I told her "No, not me. Them. All of them. And our own stupid bastards as well." Next day Germany overran Poland. A few days later Chamberlain declared war.

AN ALTERNATIVE MUST BE RESISTED

Later, when he fell, when he at last understood his stupendous errors, he sank towards death—died of shame. A man of rectitude, of orthodoxy, he meant well, tried desperately to avoid war—and made certain of it.

The basic reason for all this was that Chamberlain and the ruling class could not visualise financial change—not even with Keynes to prompt them. To them socialism was also impossible, anathema. Any alternative to capitalism must be resisted—by force if necessary. Well, they had their war—and the people fought it. Afterwards there was a parliamentary election. Certain top people remembered the dangerous revolutionary situation after 1914-18 and decided on an alternative. Ideas for a kind of welfare state had been prepared and it was obvious that a Labour government would be necessary. It would take 1,000 years to convert Conservatives to such ideas, so shock treatment was prescribed. Let Labour in, and the workers would be diverted into rebuilding capitalism. Problem—how could the election be lost to the Conservatives? Simple. Just let the old war-horse Churchill loose—let him insult everyone, left, right and centre, and he was bound to lose. He did—magnificently! Returned soldiers with blazing eyes used to say "Get rid of the bloodthirsty old bastard!" Labour was elected—and fags went up—prefabs went up—beer went up—taxes and everything else went up—except wages. Austerity was the word. Every-

one was held back—to save the system. Even the bosses could be threatened with the sack (nationalisation) if they failed to get a move on.

And Churchill? He, heart-broken, went off to America in a filthy state of disgust and publicly declared the cold-war on Russia!

But five years of austerity became too much for the British—they wanted freedom, so they put the Tories in. There was a great loosening up, restrictions were abolished and scrambling for money became the order of the day. Accountants told their big clients: "Get in and get your pickings while you can—before it is too late." They did! And so did those in the middle-class who were able to. And the workers, sensing all this, joined in and drove wages higher and higher by threats, strikes and all the cunning devices developed in past years of poverty. Many large firms were willing to pay high wages for high output—they thus built up businesses, retained their workers and their customers, in disregard of "orthodox" capitalist thought. These were/are run by progressive professional managers who now form a new middle class. They are clever, energetic, understanding and inclined to do a deal with their workers. They keep their fingers crossed however because they are really as liable to the sack as their workers if things go wrong.

Finance capital is affronted by all this—the poorer members of the old dying middle class are mad with rage and envy, and employers in industry dependant on cheap labour, can see the work-house.

And so we reach the present squeeze, the latest of the many attempts to reduce wages, to stabilise money and thus to enhance the riches of the rich. The assumption is that labour, industry, is going to be organised by the up and coming young men with middle class pretensions. All the brains will be at the top and monetary control will keep labour subservient to the system. In other words, "The accountants are moving in." International bankers insist on this. After all "we" now owe them 500 million pounds recently borrowed. All classes, Top, Middle and Bottom have been collaring too much—so somebody must have less. Everybody looks at the workers: "The greedy bastards!" Will the squeeze succeed? Ask Lord Rotes—he is only the latest mug to try the "Big man making a stand". Once it was Alick Dick. Another time it was the London bus chief. The London Airport chiefs still fancy themselves as heroes. All such men are gambling (with other peoples' money!) their business away. They are mugs for high finance, international bankers. Really, clever managers are business men—and mind their own business.

And the workers? They work—and wait. Nobody can do without them, and they know it. The world bankers know it too. Their system is in a mess—too much "enterprise" and greed will burst it, too little and it will die. A stable world currency is needed desperately, and time and greed are against it. The present stand for stability is vital for the system. As the *Guardian's* City Editor put it on November 20th, "What is at stake is the entire Western currency system"—nothing less than the foundation of Western capitalism.

REG. WRIGHT.

We are only repeating the obvious when we say that financially we are in a very serious position. Yet it is also obvious that many of our readers appear to be unaware of this for we estimate that approximately 1,000 copies that are dispatched each week either in single copies or in bundles are not being paid for. Some of these readers we know cannot afford to pay, and we gladly send them copies free; some copies we exchange with other journals, and some go to groups, as on the West Coast of the U.S., and Chicago, who donate to the deficit fund. But that still leaves us with some 600 copies which are not paid for. If those readers wrote to say they

did not wish to receive our publications we would save in raw materials and postage alone £1 (\$2.80) per person per year or a total of £600; and if they paid their subscriptions we should be £900 better off; in fact we would, with the donations to the deficit just be able to balance our budget.

What about it, those of you who receive FREEDOM and ANARCHY and never put your hand in your money pockets? Let's see the colour of it, and before the end of this month! And to those who are paid up with their subs. but think our effort worthwhile: "Don't forget the Deficit Fund". Thanks!

Weekend School at Cambridge on Workers' Control

ON 18th and 19th November the National Association of Labour Student Organisations held a weekend school on "Industrial Democracy and Workers' Control". Cambridge University Labour Club were hosts, and about 40 members of student Labour clubs in the Midlands and South were present. NALSO is subsidised by the Labour Party, but the member clubs nearly all pursue a violently dissident line, the CND wing prevailing by about two to one.

On Saturday afternoon we had Clive Jenkins, general secretary of ASSET, and Jim Garst, American labour journalist, on "What went wrong with the Unions". Garst felt that their subscriptions are mostly far too low, they should employ more full-time officials, and keep up much stronger and more constant pressure on the employers, instead of taking a tilt at them whenever there is enough money in the strike fund. Jenkins agreed, and thought that more unions should follow ASSET's example and pay their leaders salaries in the executive range. He gave a fascinating account of machinations at Blackpool and vigorously debunked the "national interest" cant which is currently being bandied about by Lloyd and company. Both speakers felt that the geographical structure of the unions is wrong: if the unions were to organise themselves by companies, with an officer taking charge of all activity in all branches of an organisation, managements would not be able to play areas off against each other, paying different rates to people doing the same job in different branches of the same industry; and union men would be able to take advantage of the particular weak points in certain directors' defences.

After tea John Hughes, lecturer at Ruskin College, spoke on "What went wrong with Nationalisation". He said that people expect the nationalised industries to be run in the same way as private ones. Thus we have the same capitalist system, the same antagonism between employer and employed. Hughes suggested that only when all the main private industries have been nationalised, and people have to stop asking why the Coal Board does not make

profits as big as Unilever or ICI, can we break away from the capitalist structure. This seemed rather improbable but it was quite persuasively stated. In the meantime, the onus was on the workers to extend their spheres of control; nobody else could or should do it for them.

The jazz rave in the evening was a great success, with 100 couples jiving to the University Jazz Band; we were able to enjoy live modern jazz of a really high standard, despite a group of Welshmen singing "Avanti Popolo" at the bar where the celibates congregated. A profit was made of £16, which will help to pay off the deficit on our club magazine, "Cambridge Forward" (get a sample copy, only 1/1d. including postage, from D. Knowles, Clare College, Cambridge or Freedom Bookshop).

Next day Liljana Ristic, a Yugoslavian student in Cambridge, spoke about workers' control in Yugoslavia. She painted quite an attractive picture, which was supported by various people who had been on unpaid road-building holidays there. The government lays down an overall plan, within which the co-operatives have quite a bit of scope. Thus if you are making soap you can't change overnight to making margarine, but you can put in perfume if you think

that will improve it, without consulting any outside authority. Workers elect committees which are changed at fairly frequent intervals, and if any important change is proposed they hold a meeting of the whole factory. About 10 years ago, when the system was just catching on, there was an exceptional harvest; some farms used the extra money to buy tractors, others on a prolonged communal booze-up. Next year of course they learned the lesson of the wise and the foolish virgins.

There were some questions about the extent to which the government interferes. There is a minimum wage, and beyond a certain point there is very high taxation, so there is a more or less effective maximum for nearly everybody. Like every other country in the world Yugoslavia is short of technologists and scientists; so there are industrial and agricultural consultants whom the co-operatives can call in for short periods, and competition for their services is such that they don't waste all their talents on one small unit; and conversely every small unit can afford to have an "expert" in for a certain time.

Then Tom Brown put the syndicalist point of view. He outlined the idea of the stay-in strike as a weapon and called for its more frequent use. Very few

people had heard of the Syndicalist Workers' Federation, and it took him some time to get across to the largely middle-class gathering of university socialists. After he had sketched a picture of what Britain would be like as an anarcho-syndicalist country, he was asked how we would be able to co-exist with a presumably hostile outside world, and was unconvincing in his answer. It is evident that not enough people have worked out how they would put an anarchist utopia "into orbit"—this is the real problem and until we solve it anarcho-syndicalism will not succeed on more than a limited scale. (Though, as Brown pointed out, it does function in modern industry, in all kinds of ways, a lot more than most of us realise).

In the afternoon Ken Weller, AEU shop-steward and direct-actionist, introduced a discussion on the problems and possibilities of workers' control. This was the best session, with many people contributing from their own experience and knowledge. He showed that it is not just workers' control we should fight for; not just the Bomb we should fight against. If workers' control is to be revived it will come in a wave of direct action against the bomb, bosses, police, the lot. It is really encouraging that this idea is catching on, though there

are still some people who are not yet on the ball.

Discussion covered the BLSP strike (then still going strong); the National Coal Board and its disastrous policy in closing down collieries in Wales; Brora Colliery in Scotland which reopened in October under workers' control; the progress the Committee of 100 had so far made in the docks; the vested interest of the unions in struggle for its own sake; the revolutionary ideals of Cambridgeshire's most militant schoolteacher, etc., etc. About 4.30 the discussion broke up so that various speakers could catch their trains. A collection was taken for the BLSP strike fund.

So what did we achieve? Maybe not very much. Very few students know much about workers' control, fewer still pin their hopes on it. But we did get talking about it, most of us for the first time. Some may have been inspired to do some research—at any rate, we weren't flogging a dead horse because we can see how workers' control can and does succeed in various circumstances. Not only did we enjoy ourselves; we learned from each other.

TIM OXTON.

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP CENTRAL MEETINGS

meetings to be held at
The Two Brewers,
40 Monmouth Street, WC2
(Leicester Square Tube)
Sundays at 7.30 p.m.

DEC 10 'S.F.' on:
Illusion and Reality
DEC 17 Gramophone Recital by
John Pilgrim on:
Sex and Folk-Music
DEC 24 No meeting: Saturnalia

OFF-CENTRE DISCUSSION MEETINGS

1st Thursday of each month at 8 p.m. at Jack and Mary Stevenson's, 6 Stainton Road, Enfield, Middx.

Last Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. at Dorothy Barasi's, 45 Twyford Avenue, Fortis Green, N.2.

1st Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. at Colin Ward's, 33 Ellerby Street, Fulham, S.W.6.

3rd Thursday of each month at 8 p.m. at Donald Room's, 148a Fellows Road, Swiss Cottage, N.W.3.

Last Friday of each month at 8 p.m. at Laurens and Celia Otter's, 57 Ladbroke Road, W.11.

—NB.—December meeting on 23rd.

JAZZ CLUB

This season's meetings are being held at 4 Albert Street Mornington Crescent NW1 at approximately monthly intervals.

ANARCHY Nos 1-9

Still Available 1/8 Post Free

Freedom

The Anarchist Weekly

FREEDOM appears on the first three Saturdays of each month.

On the last Saturday, we publish ANARCHY, a 32-page journal of anarchist ideas (1/8 or 25c. post free).

Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM and ANARCHY

12 months 30/- (U.S. & Canada \$5.00)
6 months 15/- (\$2.50)
3 months 8/- (\$1.25)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies

12 months 45/- (U.S. & Canada \$7.50)
6 months 22/6 (\$3.50)

AIR MAIL Subscription Rates

(FREEDOM by Air Mail, ANARCHY by Surface Mail)
12 months 50/- (U.S. & Canada \$8.00)

Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only.

1 year (40 issues) 19/- (U.S. & Canada \$3)
6 months (20 issues) 9/6 (\$1.50)
3 months 10 issues 5/- (\$0.75)

Air Mail Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only.

1 year (40 issues) 40/- (\$6.00)

Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers:

FREEDOM PRESS

17a MAXWELL ROAD
LONDON, S.W.6. ENGLAND
Tel: RENOWN 3736.

Our Finances

SEE PAGE 3

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT DECEMBER 1st 1961 WEEK 48

Expenses: 48 weeks at £70	£3,360
Income from Sales & Subs.:	
Weeks 1—47	£1,479
Week 48	£24
	£1,503
DEFICIT	£1,857

DEFICIT FUND

New York: J.S. £3/10/-; Cheltenham: L.G.W.* £4; London: K.M. 7/3; Glasgow: J.H.* 2/-; Wolverhampton: J.L.* 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; Oxford: G.E.L. 3/1; Surrey: F.B.* 5/-; Exmouth: A.B.H. 5/6; Hounslow: L.* 2/6; Dalkeith: T.E.B. 5/-; Reading: M.B. 13/6; Oxford: Anon. 5/-; Smethwick: E.W. 6/7.

TOTAL 10 9 11
Previously acknowledged 969 13 7

1961 TOTAL TO DATE £980 3 6

*Indicates Regular Contributor.

ONLY £900 MORE!

SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'

Vol 1 1951: Mankind is One
Vol 2 1952: Postscript to Posterity
Vol 3 1953: Colonialism on Trial
Vol 4 1954: Living on a Volcano
Vol 5 1955: The Immoral Moralists
Vol 6 1956: Oil and Troubled Waters
Vol 7 1957: Year One—Sputnik Era
Vol 8 1958: Socialism in a Wheelchair
Vol 9 1959: Print, Press & Public
Vol 10 1960: The Tragedy of Africa
Each volume: paper 7/6 cloth 10/6

The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of FREEDOM at 5/- post free.

PAUL ELTZBACHER

Anarchism (Seven Exponents of the Anarchist Philosophy) cloth 21/-

CHARLES MARTIN

Towards a Free Society 2/6

RUDOLF ROCKER

Nationalism and Culture cloth 21/-

ERRICO MALATESTA

Anarchy 9d.

JOHN HEWETSON

Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2/6 paper 1/-

VOLENE

Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12/6
The Unknown Revolution (Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) cloth 12/6

Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications:

Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A tribute cloth 5/-

Journey Through Utopia cloth 18/- (U.S.A. \$3)

Co-exist?

IS 'Co-existence' a myth or a realisable possibility? Can we formulate some even more rational and more secure basis for the continuance of the 'systems' which prevail over the greater part of the globe today? Christopher Mayhew, in his article in the *Guardian* on November 7th, concludes rightly that competitive co-existence is an inferior conception, unsuited to the new age which we are entering.

Men of perception have long realised the truth of such a conclusion. K. E. Boulding, professor of economics at the University of Michigan, has written* that "When we ask where is the Great Revolution taking us, the revolution that is science and technology, the answer may emerge that the end product of this revolution does not depend as much as we thought on the road which is followed. If one presses the Communists on what they mean by communism—that is, that ideal state of society toward which they hope they are moving, and which they do not now claim to have—the pat answer is, of course, that communism is a society in which we have 'from each according to his ability and to each according to his needs'. If they are

*"The U.S. and Revolution"—Centre for the Study of Democratic Institution.

pressed further on who is to be the judge of need and ability, the answer seems to be that, subject to the socialising forces of society, the individual is to be his own judge. Certainly no dictator can judge either the need or the ability of the innumerable variety of men. This means, therefore, that in this ideal world people will decide what standard of life they wish to adopt and then go out and earn the kind of income which enables them to support it. We are getting closer and closer to this in the United States. What the Communists mean by communism, therefore, turns out to be surprisingly like that affluent society which is also the end of capitalist development."

What, then, are the two monolithic power blocs—and, make no mistake, both blocs are now really monolithic—fighting for? Only one answer is apparent to the present writer—religion. For communism is as much a religion to its adherents as Christianity is to its postulants, even more so because the 'revealed

truth' is a relatively new and fresh conception and the disciples and followers have not yet had sufficient time to discover to the full its fallibility. The parallel between communist-monopoly and the still developing christian-capitalist-monopoly is remarkable but unmistakable. Both, like all of man's institutions, are very fallible and the question arises whether they are not, by their very size, inimical to man's best interests. Both are apostles of "freedom"—for the subjects of the other side! Both have their heretics who have been publicly pilloried and on both sides some have paid the ultimate penalty for their unbelief. Each has its holy shrine, its places of worship and its proselytizers, each holding out the inevitable 'carrot' of material and/or spiritual-ethical well-being (a 'tax-free' society on the one hand, the £1,000 a year income on the other). Each threatens the other with fire and brimstone if the holy land is invaded. The trappings of public demonstration, the malleable crowds, the processions, the ritual speeches, could transposed, serve as well on the one side as the other.

Why then is there no will for agreement, tolerance and peace? Is it because those 'circles', on either side, who hold the reins of power are reluctant to put them down, to retire their fiery steeds to the by now well-earned rest of the stables of peace? Are they, as seems indisputable, intoxicated by their 'success' in manipulating their 'public opinion'? Of this latter condition there seems little doubt. So long as 'the people' accept, without much questioning, the daily injection of propaganda—whether of communist doctrine through *Pravda*, *Izvestia* and the Soviet radio or of 'democratic' doctrine through the 'free' Western press and its radio—so long shall we continue at best to merely co-exist. Man, in his infinite variety, cannot long endure the existing condition of 'no-war', 'no-peace'. If, as Eisenhower suggested not so long ago, the governments of the world do not get out of his way and leave him in real peace then it will be, to put it mildly, just too bad for the governments. Let us see, instead of consolidation within the existing blocs, an immediate move towards the 'withering away'—of the blocs and of the states. A return to individuality, a renunciation of monopoly is inevitable; let it begin now.

B. C. BEVIS.

GREETING CARDS

THROUGH the generosity of an artist friend we have available a few cards which can be used for greetings.

They carry no message, are folded cards printed with six different lino-cut designs taken from diverse sources, such as cave painting, African carving, etc., and were cut by painter Bruno Manini, and printed in red or black.

Available from Freedom Press now, at 1s. each including envelope, all proceeds to the Press Fund.

... some are more equal than others

News Item: 2

Lord and Lady Ednam flew off to Rome yesterday.

Lady Ednam—better known as the actress Maureen Swanson—lost her baby, born prematurely, a few weeks ago.

Later this week Lord and Lady Ednam will pick up a ship at Naples and sail away round the world to forget the strain of the past few months.

(Sunday Pictorial)

News Item: 1

While King Saud of Saudi Arabia was having treatment for ulcers in a Boston, Massachusetts, hospital yesterday, one of his four wives took off her black veil and went shopping. The reason given was that it attracted too much attention. The Queen was seen to be a dark-haired, pretty woman of about 30, with almond-shaped eyes. It took her servants half-an-hour to unload her purchases from a fleet of royal Cadillacs when she returned to the hospital.

(Daily Herald)

News Item: 3

It looks as though Fiona, Baroness Thyssen, is going to have a pleasant Christmas. At a Christie's sale of mediaeval works of art and Renaissance jewellery today, her father, Rear Admiral K. Campbell-Walter, bought two exquisite ornaments for £8,190 each.

Although he was loth to comment himself, he is thought to have been buying on behalf of his son-in-law, the immensely wealthy Baron Thyssen, who married Fiona Campbell-Walker in 1956. Two thirds of this sale, which totalled £89,227, consisted of the collection formed by the late Paul Horst. It brought his son, Robert, £51,395, less commission.

Paul Horst was an American of German origin who made money from hops. His son commutes between Paris, Switzerland and Deauville.

The Duchess of Norfolk smiled a small, satisfied smile and left when the total for the objects from her husband's collection came to £10,437.

(Londoner's Diary)



FREEDOM PRESS PUBLICATIONS